

IN THE SPECIFICATION:

In response to the Examiner's comments regarding the state of the specification in the PTO, submitted herewith is a clean copy of the originally filed specification (as-filed copy), a copy of the published application (publication), and a copy of the specification from the PTO PAIR site - File Wrapper section (PTO copy).

In review, the Examiner noted a number of errors in the PTO copy, and required correction. Applicant responded with the argument that the errors were scanning errors on the PTO's part, and that the as-filed application did not contain such errors, and therefore, there was no need for correction.

In response to this argument, the Examiner still contended that the errors exist at the PTO and therefore correction was necessary.

It is now submitted that the PTO electronic file of the application does not contain the scanning errors shown in the PTO copy. This statement is based on the fact that, except for two instances, the errors noted in the office action are not present in the published application. For the Examiner's benefit, the errors in the PTO copy are highlighted, and the corresponding locations in the publication are also highlighted. Comparing these two documents reveals a number of things. First, the errors occur in the first two or last two lines of the PTO copy. Moreover, the error involves a missing "e" or missing "o", although almost all errors are a missing "e". Second, this comparison shows that two instances of missing "e"s carried over into the publication, i.e., [0038], line 5, corresponding to page 6 line 2 of the PTO copy, and [0052], line 6, corresponding to page 8, line 2 of the PTO copy (the carryover errors)

These carryover errors are fixed by amendment to the specification. However, since the other errors identified in the office action and found in the PTO copy did not occur upon publication, it is submitted that these errors do not need correction by amendment to the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the revisions to the specification and the arguments above demonstrate that the specification, in fact, is now in proper condition for allowance.

The specification is also amended to identify the correct patent number on page 1. In addition, the paragraph on page 6 concerning the radial projections is corrected to properly identify the two angles α_1 and α_2 shown in Figure 2b, and identify the correct reference numerals

as projections 20e and 20i. Lastly, the other informality noted on page 6 regarding the projections 20e' has been addressed below.

On page 1, amend the paragraph beginning on line 23 as follows:

That solution, as disclosed for example in patent [[EP 0 742 377]] EP 0 740 077 presents numerous drawbacks, and in particular:

On page 5 after the paragraph beginning with "Figure 10 is an ...", please add the following paragraph:

Figure 11 is a diagrammatic section view of another embodiment of the invention.

On page 5, revise the paragraph beginning on line 31 as follows:

The ring meshes between two supports comprising a central hub 3 and a rim 4 presenting faces 31 and 41 that face the complementary faces 21i and 21i of the ring. The rim and the hub are made of metal or of plastics material in the example shown, while [[th]] the ring is made of rubber. The ring may be obtained by combining an elastomer material with a metal reinforcing insert, or a plurality of materials or a single elastomer material of different densities:

On page 6, line 12, amend the paragraph as follows:

In a second example shown diagrammatically in Figure 2b, the side flanks 22b of the projections 20e and 20i are radially flared away from the central core 1. The projections present an "hourglass" shape in section of trapezoidal form, with a mean flare angle α_3 that may be as much as 60°, as shown. Figure 11 shows projections 20e' that [[has]] have a hyperbolic or curved shape.

On page 6, please amend the paragraph beginning on line 25 as follows:

With radial projections, the square of the ratio of the radii of the cylindrical faces 21e and 21i $(R1/R2)^2$ is advantageously substantially equal to the inverse of the ratio of the angles at the center intercepting two projections [[21e]] 20e and [[21i]] 20e on respective faces (α_2/α_1) $[(\alpha_2/\alpha_1)]$. This dimensioning causes the shear stresses K_1 exerted on the ring as a whole to be made uniform and constant, said stresses being located mainly at the roots of the projections.

This dimensioning also makes the shear reversible when going from one direction of rotation to the other.

On page 7, revise the paragraph beginning on line 30 as follows:

In a variant shown in an exploded view in Figure 5, the ring 2a is split. The opening 5 formed in this way makes assembly easier by enabling it to be opened out while the hub 3 is being inserted and by enabling it to be compressed while it is being inserted in the rim 4, thereby enabling play between said parts to be compensated. ~~[[Th]]~~ The spreading forces exerted by the hub on the ring are compensated by the compression exerted by the rim on said ring. Once assembly is completed, no play remains between the parts.